



IFU

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPlicant DKT. : VT3B-109922-004)
APPLICANT : Juranitch and Olschefski) Examiner
SERIAL NO. : 10/737,172) Jewel V. Thompson
FILED : December 16, 2003)
FOR : Isolation Arrangement) AU 2855
For System Under Test) Conf. No.
4464)

Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

*** **

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

The undersigned hereby certifies that this document has been forwarded via first class, postage prepaid mail to the Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on Tuesday, the day after the Independence Day holiday, July 5, 2005.


RAPHAEL A. MONSANTO, REG. NO. 28,448

*** **

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

SIR :

In response to the Restriction Requirement in the Office Action of June 2, 2005, Applicants state as follows:

REMARKS

Amendments are presented herein to improve the form of the subject application and in response to the Examiner's comments in the above-identified Office Action.

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

APPLICANTS: Juranitch and Olschefski; SN: 10/737,172; FILED: December 16, 2003

ATTY DKT.: VT3B-105883-004; Examiner Jewel Vergie Thompson; Confirmation No. 4464; AU 2855

Election/Restriction Requirement

The Examiner has required restriction to one of the following inventions under 35 U.S.C. § 121, which the Examiner has, pursuant to correction during telephone conference, characterized as:

- I. Claims 1-50, drawn to an arrangement for isolating a rotating mechanical system and method of testing a rotating mechanical system, classified in class 73, generally subclass 862.322; and
- II. Claims 51-68, drawn to a method of signal analysis, classified in class 702, subclass 113.

The inventions are considered by the Examiner to be distinct, each from the other, because the various groups are considered by the Examiner to be unrelated. The Examiner further asserts that the inventions are not disclosed as being capable of being used together.

Because the Examiner believes that these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications, restriction for examination purposes is deemed by the Examiner to be proper.

Election

In response to the Examiner's restriction requirement, Applicants hereby elect to continue prosecution of the claims of Group I (claims 1-50). Applicants acknowledge that claims 51-68 stand withdrawn from further consideration in this application.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider the present application, allow the claims, and pass the application for issue. If the Examiner believes that the

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

APPLICANTS: Juranitch and Olschefski; SN: 10/737,172; FILED: December 16, 2003

ATTY DKT.: VT3B-105883-004; Examiner Jewel Vergie Thompson; Confirmation No. 4464; AU 2855

prosecution of this case can be expedited by a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to call attorney for Applicants at the telephone number indicated hereinbelow.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. A. Monsanto', with a stylized flourish at the end.

RAM:rb:RRR.VT3B

Raphael A. Monsanto
Reg. No. 28,448
Rohm & Monsanto, P.L.C.
660 Woodward Avenue, Suite 1525
Detroit, MI 48226
Telephone (313) 886-1966
Telecopier (313) 884-4806